**Methodological Report Form Guidelines**

**Fieldwork 2022**

Thank you for working as a partner of the World Justice Project in the production of the WJP Rule of Law Index. Before fieldwork starts, we wanted to send you our methodological reporting form, which will allow you to provide information about your survey design and data collection process. We are sending this form now so you know what information we will need at the end of the project. This information will help in interpreting the data, help to ensure that the data are reliable and valid, and protect the legitimacy and credibility of the product. Below are some notes about the form.

* Use the provided examples and follow-up questions within the reporting form to assist you as you fill out this form.
* If you need to attach any other materials to the reporting form, please append them to the end of the reporting form. This will help keep all of your materials together and organized and will assist us in archiving these documents.
* Make sure to include the name of the country in which polling is being conducted and the name of your company and where it is based at the top of the reporting form.
* If you are conducting polling in multiple countries, please submit a separate report for each country.
* Please try to answer each section as thoroughly and completely as possible.

Please contact us if you have any questions or concerns about this form. Thank you for your cooperation.

**General Population Poll**

**Full Fieldwork Methodological Report Form 2022**

1. **Introduction:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | COMPANY RESPONSE |
| 1. This Methodological Report Form is for the survey conducted in: (*Country*) | Suriname |
| 1. The sampling, fieldwork, and data processing for this survey was completed by: (*Company*) | D3 Systems |
| 1. This company is based in: (*Company Headquarters*) | McLean, VA, United States |

1. **Contact Information:**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Who is the company’s contact person(s) for follow up questions? |
| Emily Kayser |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. What are the contact person’s email address and phone number? |
| [emily.kayser@d3systems.com](mailto:emily.kayser@d3systems.com)  (703) 388-2450 |

1. **General Description:**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. What were the exact dates of fieldwork? |
| May 26, 2022 – June 17, 2022 |

|  |
| --- |
| While the poll is nationally representative, what were the principle geographic areas targeted for full fieldwork? (i.e. regions, provinces, states) |
| The principal geographic areas were 9 of the 10 Districts in Suriname. The district of Sipaliwini was excluded  from the sample due to its inaccessibility. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. What was the mode of interviewing? (e.g. face-to-face; online) |
| Face-to-Face CAPI |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. What was the achieved sample size? |
| n=502 |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. In what language(s) were the interviews conducted? |
| Dutch |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. What was the average length of each interview? |
| 51:37 minutes |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. What was the length of the longest and shortest interviews? |
| Shortest: 29 minutes  Longest: 1 hour and 44 minutes |

1. **Customization of Questionnaire:**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Please list all final adaptations to the terminology of the questionnaire (e.g. **q5a\_G1**: Changed “President” to “Prime Minister” or **q1\_G1**: Changed “Environmental Protection Authority” to “Department of Conservation”). |
| Questionnaire Customization  The following localizations were made to ensure that the questionnaire functions as intended in Suriname:   * President is used throughout, and “Chan Santokhi” is used where the name of the president is indicated. * The National Assembly is used in place of Parliament. * The Surinamese word “tjoekoe” was used in addition to the English word bribe throughout. * The descriptive phrase “Ambtenaren van ROGB, GLIS, of Landmeters” was added to further explain to what a land registry officer refers (Q6n). * Governor was removed from Q7k-Q10k. * Ministers replaced the term Secretary throughout. * District or Jurisdiction replaced Municipality throughout. * The descriptive phrase “kosteloze rechtsbijstand door advocat in dienst van de overheid” (free legal assistance from a lawyer employed by the government) was added to ensure respondents understood the meaning of Public Defense Attorney.   Additionally, based on pre-test results which indicated that questions on disability negatively impacted the survey experience for respondents, disability and disability2 were removed from the survey. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Please list a. ethnic groups, b. religious preferences, c. income brackets, and d. levels of education applied in the customization of the questionnaire’s demographic section. For income, please specify the currency and the time period used for reporting income. For education, please provide the number of years of schooling and the level of advancement for each education level. |
| * Ethnicity   + Hindustani   + Creole   + Javanese   + Maroon   + Amer Indian   + Mixed   + White   + Chinese   + Other   + Don't know/No answer * Religion   + Roman Catholic   + Evangelical Brotherhood (EBG)   + All other Christian religions   + Muslim: Soenni   + Muslim: Amadya   + All other Muslim religions   + Hindu: Sanathan Dharma   + Hindu: Arya Semaadj   + All other Hindu religions   + Wintie   + Sjamanism/nature religion   + Javanism   + No Faith/Atheist   + Buddhism   + No religion but believes in God   + Other   + Don't know/No answer * Education   + None   + Elementary school diploma (achieved after 6 years)   + Middle school diploma (4 years)   + High school diploma or equivalent (3 years)   + Bachelor's degree (3 to 4 years)   + Graduate degree (Masters, Ph.D.) (variable)   + Vocational (4 years)   + Don't know/No answer * Income   + Income data was not universally available, so open-ended income question was applied to respondents selected for polling |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Please list any other changes to the demographic section of the questionnaire. |
| N/A |

1. **Survey Design:**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. What was the target population/sample universe for the survey? |
| Surinamese adults aged 18 and older |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. What was the coverage error associated with the survey design? |
| Assuming a Design Effect of 3.36 and p= 0.5, at the 95% CI level with n= 502 the resulting complex MOE is 8.04%. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Please list and describe each of the sampling units included in the survey? For example, the sampling units may be:  * Region (primary sampling unit) * City (secondary sampling unit) * District (tertiary sampling unit) * Neighborhood (quaternary sampling unit) * Enumeration area |
| | **Sample Point Number** | **Region** | **Enumeration Area** | **Population** | **Urbanity** | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 1001 | Brokopondo | Brokopondo Centrum | 4482 | Rural | | 1002 | Brokopondo | Brownsweg | 4793 | Rural | | 1003 | Commewijne | Alkmaar | 5561 | Rural | | 1004 | Commewijne | Meerzorg | 12405 | Rural | | 1005 | Commewijne | Meerzorg | 12405 | Rural | | 1006 | Commewijne | Tamanredjo | 6601 | Rural | | 1007 | Coronie | Johanna Maria | 648 | Rural | | 1008 | Marowijne | Albina | 5247 | Rural | | 1009 | Marowijne | Moengo | 10834 | Rural | | 1010 | Nickerie | Nieuw Nickerie | 12818 | Rural | | 1011 | Nickerie | Nieuw Nickerie | 12818 | Rural | | 1012 | Nickerie | Wageningen | 2937 | Rural | | 2013 | Nickerie | Westelijke Polders | 8616 | Rural | | 1014 | Para | Para Noord | 9703 | Rural | | 1015 | Para | Para Noord | 9703 | Rural | | 1016 | Para | Para Oost | 8016 | Rural | | 1017 | Paramaribo | Beekhuizen | 17185 | Urban | | 1018 | Paramaribo | Beekhuizen | 17185 | Urban | | 1019 | Paramaribo | Blauwgrond | 31483 | Urban | | 1020 | Paramaribo | Blauwgrond | 31483 | Urban | | 1021 | Paramaribo | Blauwgrond | 31483 | Urban | | 1022 | Paramaribo | Centrum Paramaribo | 20631 | Urban | | 1023 | Paramaribo | Flora | 19538 | Urban | | 1024 | Paramaribo | Flora | 19538 | Urban | | 1025 | Paramaribo | Latour | 29526 | Urban | | 1026 | Paramaribo | Latour | 29526 | Urban | | 1027 | Paramaribo | Latour | 29526 | Urban | | 1028 | Paramaribo | Munder | 17234 | Urban | | 1029 | Paramaribo | Munder | 17234 | Urban | | 1030 | Paramaribo | Pontbuiten | 23211 | Urban | | 1031 | Paramaribo | Pontbuiten | 23211 | Urban | | 1032 | Paramaribo | Rainville | 22747 | Urban | | 1033 | Paramaribo | Rainville | 22747 | Urban | | 1034 | Paramaribo | Tammenga | 15819 | Urban | | 1035 | Paramaribo | Weg naar Zee | 16037 | Urban | | 1036 | Paramaribo | Weg naar Zee | 16037 | Urban | | 1037 | Paramaribo | Welgelegen | 19304 | Urban | | 1038 | Saramacca | Jarikaba | 5963 | Rural | | 1039 | Saramacca | Wayomboweg | 1560 | Rural | | 1040 | Wanica | De Nieuwe Grond | 26161 | Urban | | 1041 | Wanica | De Nieuwe Grond | 26161 | Urban | | 1042 | Wanica | Domburg | 5661 | Urban | | 1043 | Wanica | Houttuin | 15656 | Urban | | 1044 | Wanica | Koewarasan | 27713 | Urban | | 1045 | Wanica | Koewarasan | 27713 | Urban | | 1046 | Wanica | Koewarasan | 27713 | Urban | | 1047 | Wanica | Kwatta | 14151 | Urban | | 1048 | Wanica | Lelydorp | 18663 | Urban | | 1049 | Wanica | Lelydorp | 18663 | Urban | | 1050 | Wanica | Saramacca Polder | 10217 | Urban | |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Please describe, in detail, the sampling plan and stratifications that were monitored during fieldwork.    1. What variables were involved? (e.g. city, gender, age, socio-economic status, etc.)    2. What questions/criteria were used to classify a respondent for each relevant stratum?    3. What information source was used to set targets? (e.g. census data, population statistics, etc.)   Please include a link to the data source or an attachment if possible. |
| The sample was stratified by 9 administrative districts, resulting in a total of 9 strata. All strata were either entirely urban or entirely rural. Sample distribution was proportional to population size.  In each stratum, communes served as the primary sampling unit (PSU). PSUs are sampled via probability proportionate to size systematic (PPSS) sampling. Total population was used as the measure of size.  Prior to the selection of PSUs, an accessibility assessment was performed by the field team and D3. PSUs that were determined to be inaccessible due to remote location were removed from the sampling frame. As of the last accessibility assessment, the entire district of Sipaliwini was excluded from the sampling frame.  The Sampling Frame was the General Statistics Bureau of Suriname 2012. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Were you able to achieve the sample distribution proposed in the sampling plan?    1. If so, did you achieve it through random sampling or did you need to apply quotas?    2. If you applied quotas, please describe the process for selecting respondents to fill these quotas.    3. Did you use any weights to adjust the sample after fieldwork was completed? |
| A probability-based sampling methodology with random route for household selection was implemented for the WJP National Survey. D3 recommends the variable FinalWgt2 for national analysis. D3 provided an unweighted dataset and a weighting variable for application in national analysis. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Please describe, in detail, the sampling method and how the sample was drawn.    1. Were any external population statistics, census data, or other sources used to draw the sample? If yes, please provide a link to the source or an attachment if possible. |
| The sample was stratified by 9 administrative districts as designated by the General Statistics Bureau of Suriname (2012), resulting in a total of 9 strata in the final sample. Each stratum was allocated sampling points in proportion to population.  In each stratum, communes served as the primary sampling unit (PSU). PSUs are sampled via probability proportionate to size systematic (PPSS) sampling. Total population was used as the measure of size.  Prior to the selection of PSUs, an accessibility assessment was performed by the field team and D3. PSUs that were determined to be inaccessible due to remote location were removed from the sampling frame. As of the last accessibility assessment, the entire district of Sipaliwini was excluded from the sampling frame. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Please describe, in detail, how enumeration areas were selected. *By enumeration area, we mean the smallest geographic unit for data collection that is allocated to a single enumerator.* |
| In each stratum, communes served as the primary sampling unit (PSU). PSUs are sampled via probability proportionate to size systematic (PPSS) sampling. Total population was used as the measure of size. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Please list the enumeration areas selected for the survey. |
| | **Sample Point Number** | | **Enumeration Area** | | --- | --- | --- | | 1001 | Brokopondo Centrum | | | 1002 | Brownsweg | | | 1003 | Alkmaar | | | 1004 | Meerzorg | | | 1005 | Meerzorg | | | 1006 | Tamanredjo | | | 1007 | Johanna Maria | | | 1008 | Albina | | | 1009 | Moengo | | | 1010 | Nieuw Nickerie | | | 1011 | Nieuw Nickerie | | | 1012 | Wageningen | | | 2013 | Westelijke Polders | | | 1014 | Para Noord | | | 1015 | Para Noord | | | 1016 | Para Oost | | | 1017 | Beekhuizen | | | 1018 | Beekhuizen | | | 1019 | Blauwgrond | | | 1020 | Blauwgrond | | | 1021 | Blauwgrond | | | 1022 | Centrum Paramaribo | | | 1023 | Flora | | | 1024 | Flora | | | 1025 | Latour | | | 1026 | Latour | | | 1027 | Latour | | | 1028 | Munder | | | 1029 | Munder | | | 1030 | Pontbuiten | | | 1031 | Pontbuiten | | | 1032 | Rainville | | | 1033 | Rainville | | | 1034 | Tammenga | | | 1035 | Weg naar Zee | | | 1036 | Weg naar Zee | | | 1037 | Welgelegen | | | 1038 | Jarikaba | | | 1039 | Wayomboweg | | | 1040 | De Nieuwe Grond | | | 1041 | De Nieuwe Grond | | | 1042 | Domburg | | | 1043 | Houttuin | | | 1044 | Koewarasan | | | 1045 | Koewarasan | | | 1046 | Koewarasan | | | 1047 | Kwatta | | | 1048 | Lelydorp | | | 1049 | Lelydorp | | | 1050 | Saramacca Polder | | |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Were any enumeration areas substituted due to interviewer safety, inaccessibility, or other logistical reasons? If yes, please list these neighborhoods/settlements and the reason. |
| Subjective replacement of randomly selected units by the field team was strictly prohibited. The substitution of inaccessible areas was only allowed with D3 approval. Prior to the selection of PSUs, an accessibility assessment was performed by the field team and D3. PSUs that were determined to be inaccessible due to remote location were removed from the sampling frame. As of the last accessibility assessment, the entire district of Sipaliwini was excluded from the sampling frame.  Two full replacement draws drawn in the same manner as the original and at the same time. The replacements were numbered in the same manner as the original and the replacement PSU with the ID that matches the original was used. If the replacement of a PSU was necessary during fieldwork, PARTNER selected a replacement PSU from the replacement draw. There were 2 PSUs that required replacement during fieldwork, detailed below:   | **Strata** | **Original PSU** | **Replacement PSU** | **Reason for Replacement** | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Brokopondo | Brokopondo Centrum (Sample Unit 1001) | Klaaskreek (Sample Unit 2001) | Heavy flooding made the original areas inaccessible. | | Brokopondo | Brownsweg (Sample Unit 1002) | Marchallkreek (Sample Unit 2002) | Heavy flooding made the original areas inaccessible. | |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Describe, in detail, the procedure for selecting households in each enumeration area. |
| Random route sampling was used to select households. Interviewers were instructed to attempt to conduct an interview at every third household in urban areas and rural areas. For multi-storied buildings, interviewers went to the top floor, started with the first household on the right, contacted every third household on the right, and then went down to the next level before continuing. |

1. **Respondent Selection**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. How were individual respondents selected within each household? (e.g. Kish Grid; Last Birthday; Next Birthday) |
| Respondent selection within a selected household was conducted randomly using the RCS software. Eligible members of the household were listed along with their names and their age in descending order. The RCS software randomly selected an eligible respondent from this list.  Interviewers were not allowed to substitute an alternate member of a household for the randomly selected respondent. If the respondent refused to participate (all respondents were required to give consent) or was not available after three contact attempts (initial visit, plus two callbacks), the interviewer moved to another randomly selected household or the next household according to the random route. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Were all individuals required to give informed consent before completing the survey? |
| Yes, all respondents were required to give consent |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Describe the procedure for respondent substitution.    1. How many substitutions took place during the survey? |
| Interviewers were not allowed to substitute an alternate member of a household for the randomly selected respondent. If the respondent refused to participate (all respondents were required to give consent) or was not available after three contact attempts (initial visit, plus two callbacks), the interviewer moved to another randomly selected household or the next household according to the random route. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Describe the procedure for callbacks.    1. How many attempts were made to reach a selected respondent?    2. In aggregate, what were the contact percentage rates for each attempt? |
| A total of three contact attempts were made before substituting the next household along the random route. The second and third contact attempts were required to take place at different times of the day, and where feasible, over multiple days.   | **Disposition Rate Formulas** |  | | --- | --- | | **Response Rate 3 (RR):** I/((I+P)+(R+NC+O)+e(UH+UO)) | 0.857 | | **Cooperation Rate 1 (COOP):** I/((I+P)+R+O) | 0.956 | | **Refusal Rate 2 (REF):** R/((I+P)+(R+NC+O)+e(UH+UO)) | 0.032 | | **Contact Rate 2 (CON):** (I+P)+R+O/(I+P)+R+O+NC+e(UH+UO) | 0.896 |   For this study, Response Rate 3 was 85.7%, Cooperation Rate 1 was 95.6%, Refusal Rate 2 was 3.2%, and Contact Rate 2 was 89.6%. An estimate of the number of unknown households that would have been eligible is calculated using the ratio of known eligible households over total call of known eligibility (e), as per AAPOR formulas (0.87). This estimate is included in the above response rate calculations. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Were any groups of individuals deliberately excluded from the survey? (e.g. Government employees, police officers, market research professionals, etc.) |
| No |

1. **Supervision and Quality Control**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. How many interviewers worked on the project (excluding supervisors/managers)?    1. Divided into how many teams?    2. How many male and female interviewers? |
| The total field team for this survey consisted of 19 interviewers, including 1 male and 18 females. The interviewers were monitored by 5 fieldwork supervisors, and one country lead. The interviewers’ experience and additional demographic characteristics are detailed in Table 10 below:   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **ID** | **Gender** | **Age** | **Years of Experience** | **Education** | | 101 | Female | 37 | 7 | Secondary vocational | | 108 | Female | 44 | 11 | Higher vocational | | 109 | Female | 42 | 4 | Higher vocational | | 111 | Female | 31 | 2 | Secondary vocational | | 112 | Female | 34 | 10 | Higher vocational | | 113 | Female | 34 | 5 | Higher vocational | | 117 | Female | 35 | 3 | Secondary vocational | | 120 | Female | 37 | 3 | Secondary vocational | | 123 | Female | 37 | 3 | Higher vocational | | 127 | Female | 33 | 7 | Higher vocational | | 133 | Female | 30 | 3 | Secondary vocational | | 135 | Female | 32 | 9 | Secondary vocational | | 136 | Male | 60 | 2 | Higher vocational | | 137 | Female | 34 | 3 | Higher vocational | | 139 | Female | 47 | 21 | Higher vocational | | 143 | Female | 40 | 2 | Higher vocational | | 144 | Female | 42 | 21 | University | | 145 | Female | 46 | 8 | Secondary vocational | | 147 | Female | 28 | 4 | Secondary vocational | | 501 | Female | 37 | 19 | University | | 506 | Female | 51 | 26 | University | | 507 | Female | 38 | 19 | Higher Vocational | | 508 | Female | 38 | 17 | Higher vocational | | 901 | Female | 43 | 24 | University | |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Please describe how interviewers were trained for the project. |
| D3’s local partner (IDOS) led enumerator training on April 25th, 2022, in Paramaribo, Suriname. All project interviewers, managers, and supervisors were required to be present for the training meeting. D3’s project managers created the training materials, which were then translated into Dutch and presented to the fields staff by IDOS.  The following points were covered in training:  1. Survey details (content overview, sample size, fieldwork timing).  2. Contact protocols, including household and respondent selection, interviewing techniques, and recording outcome dispositions in RCS.  3. Questionnaire review, including question-by-question review, demonstration on a screen with detailed explanations of questions’ meanings, requirements (filtering instructions, “do not read,” etc.) and potential reactions from respondents.  Interviewers conducted mock interviews to test their understanding and interviewing skills before being allowed to commence fieldwork. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. What was the process for back-checking interviews?    1. How many interviews were conducted under direct supervision?    2. How many interviews were checked through in-person or telephone back-checks by the supervisory team?    3. How many back-checks were performed by the central office? |
| All interviewers were actively monitored by supervisors throughout fieldwork to ensure they were following contact procedures and properly administering the questionnaire. All interviews underwent some form of quality control based on a combination of the following protocols:   1. **Live Monitoring:** Supervisors listened to interviews in real-time for at least two interviews per interviewer to ensure quality across the field team and were present in all sampling units during administration. 2. **Back Checking:** Sixteen percent all cases were backchecked by IDOS’s central office. Back-checked cases confirmed interview location was correct and that the responses interviewers reflect respondent-provided answers during the survey. 3. **Data Checks:** During and after fieldwork, D3 ran checks on key variables to ensure accurate logic, filtering, and skip patterns. Checks between age, gender, and urbanity were tracked during field. GPS coordinates of all completed cases were reviewed to ensure that interviews were conducted in the correct Sampling Point. D3 also reviewed cases with higher than 50% non-response. Ongoing QC throughout fieldwork allowed sufficient time to correct any issues discovered. Following each review, D3 sent flagged cases to IDOS to investigate. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Please describe the quality control measures used to flag/reject interviews. (For example, geo-fencing, audio recording, photos, answer patterns) Were any questionnaires rejected for quality-control reasons?   If so, how many? |
| During and after fieldwork, D3 ran checks on key variables to ensure accurate logic, filtering, and skip patterns. Checks between age, gender, and urbanity were tracked during field. GPS coordinates of all completed cases were reviewed to ensure that interviews were conducted in the correct Sampling Point. D3 also reviewed cases with higher than 50% non-response. Ongoing QC throughout fieldwork allowed sufficient time to correct any issues discovered. Following each review, D3 sent flagged cases to IDOS to investigate.  Any interviewers who were determined to require additional training throughout fieldwork were retrained and monitored to ensure that their performance met the team’s standards. During field, no interviewers were identified as needing retraining or removal from the project.  From the combined in-field QC efforts, any cases that did not meet standards were rejected and replaced with a new interview. During in-field quality control, 14 cases were ultimately removed from the final dataset and replaced.  After fieldwork, D3 performed an additional assessment on final data quality and interviewer performance, explained in more detail below.  D3 supplements on-site quality control with a systematic and quantitative assessment of field performance. While successful fieldwork is the result of a team effort that includes supervisors and management, this assessment will focus on the performance of the interviewers. D3 evaluated data quality and interviewer performance through data logic and patterning checks. These tests searched for possible data entry errors and data anomalies, including duplicate cases, patterning or matching responses, substantive response bias, systematic non-response, and field productivity among interviewers.  All cases and interviewers flagged by D3 were investigated and validated by IDOS’s quality control team to the satisfaction of D3. Following post-fieldwork quality control conducted by D3 and IDOS, no cases were ultimately deleted from the dataset. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Please describe the data entry process.    1. How was the process supervised?    2. How many questionnaires were selected for double-entry? |
| D3 supplements on-site quality control with a systematic and quantitative assessment of field performance. While successful fieldwork is the result of a team effort that includes supervisors and management, this assessment will focus on the performance of the interviewers. D3 evaluated data quality and interviewer performance through data logic and patterning checks. These tests searched for possible data entry errors and data anomalies, including duplicate cases, patterning or matching responses, substantive response bias, systematic non-response, and field productivity among interviewers. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. What was the number of respondents who successfully completed the survey from start to finish, no matter how many DK/NA responses they provided? |
| 502 |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. What was the number of people contacted to take the survey that did not ultimately take the survey? In other words, how many people rejected to take the survey at all? |
| 19 |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. What was the number of interviews where the respondent did not complete the survey from start to finish? In other words, how many people terminated the survey early? |
| 3 |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. What was the number of people you attempted to contact to take the survey, but were ultimately unable to contact? |
| 2 |

1. **Other**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Please list all of the weights used in the final dataset, and explain how they were calculated. (Examples of weights include post-stratification weights, design weights, and population weights.) |
| A full weighting scheme was developed for this dataset with the following adjustments via weighting:   1. Base Weight: a base weight was calculated as the inverse of the probability of a respondent being selected. 2. Calibration: a post-stratification weighting adjustment was performed using the total population of Suriname or, 18+ population where applicable, as reported by the 2012 Census. 3. Rescaled: weights are also delivered in a rescaled format.   Base weights, also known as design or sampling weights, were calculated as the inverse of the probability of selection of the respondent into the sample. This weight adjusts for all units to have an equal probability of selection to ensure the representativeness of the sample.  The base weight accounts for the household selection within selected strata (assuming the random route is a simple random sample), and the respondent selection within the household. PSUs which are selected with certainty due to the size in relation to the size of the strata receive an adjusted probability of selection of one in the weighting formula.  The base weights are calculated as:  Where,  is the total number of of sampling points within each strata  is the total number of households sampled within each strata  is the total estimated number of households within each strata[[1]](#footnote-1)  is the measure of size (total population) of each strata  is the total number of adults within each household  Calibration through raking adjusts the resulting base weighted sample to external demographic benchmark targets. The variables used for post-stratification were region, gender, and age group. Small differences between the targets and the weighted achieved sample are due to the number of weighting targets in relation to the relatively small sample size of the project. Urbanicity is not treated as a weighting target since regions are either 100% rural or 100% urban, therefore using both targets is not possible. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Please provide the table of incidents and rejection rate for the survey. |
| | **Category** | **Number** | ***% of Category*** | | --- | --- | --- | | *Completed Interviews* |  |  | | Completed Interview | 502 | *100%* | | **Total Completes** | **502** | *100%* | | *Partial Interviews* |  |  | | Mid-interview refusal | 3 | *100%* | | **Total Partial Interviews** | **3** | *100%* | | *Unknown Eligibility* |  |  | | No answer at door | 5 | *7%* | | No adult currently available to speak with | 1 | *1%* | | Unable to access building/house | 1 | *1%* | | No household information shared (permanent + temporary) | 61 | *90%* | | **Total Unknown Eligibility** | **68** | *100%* | | *Non-Contacts* |  |  | | Selected respondent never available for interview | 2 | *100%* | | **Total Non-Contacts** | **2** | *100%* | | *Others* |  |  | | Contact/selected respondent did not speak the language | 1 | *100%* | | **Total Others** | **1** | *100%* | | *Refusals* |  |  | | Selected respondent refused to participate | 19 | *100%* | | **Total Refusals** | **19** | *100%* | | *Not Eligible* |  |  | | No adults (18+) at household | 25 | *23%* | | Vacant / empty house | 65 | *61%* | | Non-residential building (Not private residence) | 9 | *8%* | | Communal establishment/institution (no private dwellings) | 3 | *3%* | | Occupied but not main residence (e.g., holiday home) | 5 | *5%* | | **Total Not Eligible** | **107** | *100%* | | **Total Sampled Households** | **702** | **100%** | |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Please include any other comments on the design, implementation, and data processing for the survey. |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. The World Justice Project would like to acknowledge our polling partners in each country measured in the Index. Please enter the details for the country where you have conducted fieldwork this year, and how you would like your company’s name to appear. If you would prefer not to be publicly acknowledged, please enter “WJP in collaboration with local partner” under “Polling Company.” |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country/Territory** | **Areas Covered** | **Polling Company** | **Methodology** | **Sample** | **Year** |
| Suriname | Nationally representative | D3: Designs, Data, Decisions | Face-to-face | 502 | 2022 |

*Examples:*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country/Territory** | **Areas Covered** | **Polling Company** | **Methodology** | **Sample** | **Year** |
| Belize | Nationally representative | CID-Gallup Latin America | Face-to-face | 1020 | 2014 |
| Kyrgyzstan | Nationally representative | WJP in collaboration with  local partner | Face-to-face | 1000 | 2016 |
| United States | Nationally representative | YouGov | Online | 1018 | 2016 |

1. Estimated by dividing the population of the strata by the average household size in the stratum [↑](#footnote-ref-1)